

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested in view of the following observations.

1. In the specifications

The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors.

No new matter is introduced via amendment to the specifications.

2. In the claims

Claims 41 and 87 have been amended to recite, in part, “the at least one filter having a spectral characteristic for simultaneously transmitting light in a first set of wavelength bands and for simultaneously reflecting or absorbing light in a second set of wavelength bands.”

Support for this amendatory language may be found at least in Fig. 5, on page 13, lines 25-33, in Fig. 7, and on page 16, lines 23-36.

Claims 62, 73, and 75 are amended to correct indefinite language.

Claims 51-61, 63-64, 66-68, 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 84, 86, 91-92 have been canceled.

The claims are considered to be placed in condition for allowance.

No new matter is introduced via the amendment to the claims.

Entry of the amendment to the claims is kindly requested.

3. Election/Restrictions

Claims 51-61, 63-64, 66-68, 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 84, 86, 91-92 have been canceled.

4. Rejection of claims 62, 65, 73, 75, and 77 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

Claims 62, 73, and 75 have been amended to remove reference to plural projection devices.

Claim 65 was not addressed in the rejection and has no reference to plural projection devices.

Claim 77 was rejected for lack of antecedent basis for “the set of filters”.

Claim 77 depends from claim 73 which contains the antecedent basis in the phrase “equipped with a set of filters”.

Withdrawal of the rejection is kindly requested.

5. Rejection of claims 41-44, 50, 71, 85, and 87-90 under 35 USC 102 in view of US 7,180,554 (*Divelbiss*)

In view of the amendment to claims 41 and 87, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendment to the claims and the following observations.

Claim 41 has been amended to specify a stereoscopic projection system with at least one filter, where the at least one filter has a spectral characteristic for simultaneously transmitting light in a first set of wavelength bands and for simultaneously reflecting or absorbing light in a second set of wavelength bands.

The filters of the present invention have a special characteristic of being able to transmit or reflect or absorb multiple colors or wavelength bands. At a given point in time, a filter is passing light through in a set of wavelength bands while also reflecting or absorbing light in another set of wavelength bands.

The *Divelbiss* patent teaches a stereoscopic projection system using a digital micro-mirror device (DMD) and a color wheel, and the sequential transmission of the image occurs in two components of the system. First, the system of *Divelbiss* encodes the same image sequentially in time in each separate color with the colors corresponding to the colors on the color wheel (see col. 6, lines 34-37). The second sequential transmission occurs in the encoding of the image for the left perspective and the right perspective (see col. 19, lines 60-61).

The *Divelbiss* patent does not teach all of the features of amended claim 41. The stereoscopic projection system of the claimed invention contains at least one filter. The filter has special characteristics which allow the filter to transmit multiple colors at the same time.

In contrast, the *Divelbiss* patent allows for the transmission of only a single color or wavelength band at a time. The light from lamps in the *Divelbiss* patent is

filtered into separate colors using a color wheel (see col. 15, lines 27-30). The *Divelbiss* patent can not teach the simultaneous transmission of a set of wavelength bands since the color wheel will only allow for the transmission of a single color at each moment in time. In order to combine the colors for the viewer, the *Divelbiss* patent utilizes color multiplexing which encodes different color portions of an image (see col. 20, lines 12-19).

Furthermore, *Divelbiss* then discloses variations on the number of color segments on the color wheel and polarization states (see col. 41, line 1 – col. 42, line 10 and Figs. 26-36). Each variation clearly describes a single color for each segment on the wheel.

Accordingly, the *Divelbiss* patent fails to teach all of the features of amended claim 41. Claim 87 has been amended in the same manner as claim 41 and thus, for the reasons above, the *Divelbiss* patent does not anticipate claim 87.

Next, the *Divelbiss* patent does not render amended claims 41 and 87 obvious. The filters disclosed by the *Divelbiss* patent for color filters are color wheels. As a result, the invention of *Divelbiss* is designed around the limitations of color wheels, specifically, the ability to only display an image at a given time in one color. One example is the adjustment of the rotation rate of the color wheel to prevent color flicker (see col. 23, lines 10-14). The system of *Divelbiss* also teaches encoding specific colors in a certain image frame (see col. 20, lines 12-19). The *Divelbiss* patent contains no teaching or suggestion of using other types of filters. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the *Divelbiss* system to transmit multiple colors at the same time.

Accordingly, amended claims 41 and 87 are not obvious in view of *Divelbiss*. Moreover, claims 42-44, 50, 71, 85, and 88-90 depend from claims 41 or 87 and are likewise in condition for allowance in view of their dependency from claims 41 or 87 and their individually recited features.

Withdrawal of the rejection of the claims in view of the prior art is kindly requested.

6. Rejection of claim 83 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over US 7,180,554 (Divelbiss)

Claim 83 depends from claim 41 and is likewise in condition for allowance for the reasons above in view of their dependency from claims 41 or 87 and their individually recited features.

Withdrawal of the rejection of the claim in view of the prior art is kindly requested.

7. Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 45-49.

Claims 45-49 depend from claim 41 and are likewise in condition for allowance not only for their individually recited features but also for the reasons stated above in claim 41.

8. Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: April 15, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Justin J. Cassell/

JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,205